

NETL Life Cycle Inventory Data Process Documentation File

	Process Name:	cess Name: Well hydraulic fracture completion							
	Reference Flow:	1	pcs of Hydraulic fracturing completion						
	Brief Description:	H	ydraulic fracturin	g (frack	ing) of a horizontal	well			
	Section I: Meta Data								
Geographical Coverage:		N/A Region: N/A							
Year Data Best Represents:			2012						
Process Type:			Extraction Process (EP)						
Process Scope:		Gate-to-Gate Process (GG)							
	Allocation Applied:		No						
Completeness:			Individual Relevant Flows Captured						
	Flows Aggregated in Data Set:								
	☑ Process	☑ Energy Use		□ Ene	ergy P&D	☐ Material P&D			
	Relevant Output Flo	ws Inclu	ded in Data Se	et:					
	Releases to Air:	ases to Water: Inorganic		☐ Cri	teria Air	Other			
	Releases to Water:			□Org	ganic Emissions	☐ Other			
	Water Usage:			☐ Water Demand (throughput)					
	Releases to Soil:	□Inorga	anic Releases	□Org	ganic Releases	Other			
	Adjustable Process I	Parameto	ers:						
	lateral_len				[m] length of late	ral			
	fracture_len	fracture_len man_num_stage			[m] length of fracture stage				
	man_num_stage				[stages] Number of fracture stages, manually specified				
	man_auto				- /-	al number of stages, 1 umber of stages based			
	num_stage				[stages] Number o	of fracture stages			



NETL Life Cycle Inventory Data - Process Documentation File

treat_press [MPa] Pressure of the treatment

gravity [m/s^2] Gravitational acceleration (sea-

level)

vol_flow_rate [m³/sec] Volumetric flow rate

density [kg/m³] Density of slurry (assume

density of water)

pump_eff [Dimensionless] Efficiency of pump -

assume triplex, positive displacement

time_per_stage [hrs/stage] Time required to pump fluid

during fracture treatment for each

fracture stage

ch4_em [kg/pcs] Total methane emissions

during flowback period

fract_ch4_em [dimensionless] Fraction of total

available methane that is emitted to

atmosphere

Tracked Input Flows:

Fracturing fluid [Technosphere] Fracturing fluid Mechanical Energy [Mechanical energy] [Technosphere] Shaft energy

Tracked Output Flows:

Hydraulic fracturing completion Reference flow
Methane Emission
Methane Technosphere

Section II: Process Description

Associated Documentation

This unit process is composed of this document and the data sheet (DS) DS_Stage1_C_Lateral_hydraulic_fracture_2015.01.xlsx, which provides additional details regarding relevant calculations, data quality, and references.

Goal and Scope



This unit process provides a summary of relevant input and output flows associated with fracturing a natural gas or oil well. Inputs include fracturing fluid and the energy for the pumps. Emissions include methane emissions. The reference flow of this unit process is: 1 pcs of Hydraulic fracturing completion

Boundary and Description

Figure 1 provides an overview of the boundary of this unit process. In order to generate the necessary parameter values for this unit process, three calculations were performed:

Stage length (parameter frac_length) values were obtained from three separate sources (Range Resources, 2014; PTTC, 2011; Grieser *et al.* 2009). These values can be found within the Stage_Length tab in the DS file for this unit process. These values were used to generate a representative range of natural gas well stage lengths.

Pump power values were retrieved from multiple sources (ASME, 2012; DI, 2014; Halliburton, 2010) to generate a list of hydraulic pump horsepower typically found in use for shale hydraulic fracture completions. However, as an alternative to using the nominal horsepower ratings of the completion equipment above, the amount of hydraulic horsepower required was calculated based on flow rate and required pressure. For this method, it is assumed that fracking fluid must be raised from atmospheric pressure to the stated treatment pressure. This method supplies a more generic process that still falls in line with the nominal powers provided by the source above: the power calculated by the default parameters - 9.2 MW and the range specified by the sources above - 1.1 to 37 MW.

The next step in estimating the energy required is to look at how long the high power requirements are needed. Treatment plot data (see the Pump_power tab in the corresponding DS file) obtained from Lohoefer et al. (2006) and Borstmayer et al. (2011) show that open hole packing stimulation only requires 3-4 hours/stage; however, it makes some sense that a typical plug and perforate completion would pump for the same amount of time. The assumed key difference between the technologies is the actual time it takes between stages. Therefore, 3-4 hours/stage can be used to estimate the operating time for all pumping equipment, assuming that pumps are triplex, positive-displacement pumps. The treatment plot data can also be used to estimate fracture fluid requirements per stage. Note that the amount of slurry used is fairly consistent for these Barnett wells (~15,000 - 16,000 bbl/stage). Therefore the fluid pumping rate and assumed time on station can be used to estimate water use. The resultant water use (3.528 million gal/completion) can be checked with typical water demands of the Barnett shale, 3-5 million gallons/well.

Methane emissions & capture data were retrieved from Allen et al. (2013), and include a 95% confidence interval for the average methane emissions. This confidence interval was obtained by randomly sampling 1,000 sets of 24 and then taking the average of each set to form a larger sample population (bootstrapping). This process was repeated

within the corresponding DS file for reference. However, in order to provide a 95% confidence for the fraction of potential methane emissions that are emitted, the process was repeated for the total methane available and the sum of emissions was divided by the sum of potential methane. Excel is then used to provide the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles of the resulting 1,000 fractions. The Excel functions (randombetween) have been replaced by static values in the random number section. This process served to provide a realistic boundary of uncertainty around the expected value provided by Allen et al. (2013).

Fracturing fluid

Hydraulic fracturing (fracking) of a horizontal well

Mechanical Energy

Hydraulic fracturing completion

Key

Process

Upstream Emissions Data

Well hydraulic fracture completion: System Boundary

Methane to venting/flaring

Hydraulic fracturing completion

Figure 1: Unit Process Scope and Boundary

Table 2: Unit Process Input and Output Flows

Flow Name	Value	Units (Per Reference Flow)
Inputs		
Fracturing fluid	3.34E+04	m³
Mechanical Energy [Mechanical energy]	4.04E+02	MWh
Outputs		
Hydraulic fracturing completion	1.00E+00	
Methane [Organic emissions to air (group VOC)]	1.70E+03	kg
Methane [Intermediate product]	1.20E+05	kg

^{*} **Bold face** clarifies that the value shown *does not* include upstream environmental flows.

Embedded Unit Processes

None.

References

Range Resources, 2014	Waller, R., Amend, D., Sando, L., Freeman, M. 2014. Range Resources Corporation Company Presentation. Range Resources. Available at < http://media.corporate-ir.net/media.files/IROL/10/101196/presentations/11.10.2014_Company_Presentation.pdf >
PTTC, 2011	McKeon, M. 2011. Horizontal Fracturing in Shale Plays. Halliburton. Available at < http://www.thepttc.org/workshops/eastern_06 2111/eastern_062111_McKeon.pdf>
Grieser <i>et al.</i> 2009	Grieser, W. V., Shelley, R. F., & Soliman, M. Y. 2009. Predicting Production Outcome From Multi-stage, Horizontal Barnett Completions. Society of Petroleum Engineers. doi:10.2118/120271-MS
ASME, 2012	MacRae, M. 2012. Fracking: A Look Back. ASME. Available at: https://www.asme.org/engineering-topics/articles/fossil-power/fracking-a-look-back



NETL Life Cycle Inventory Data – Process Documentation File

DI, 2014 Triepke, J. 2014. Well Completion 101 Part 3: Well Stimulation. DrillingInfo. Available at: http://info.drillinginfo.com/well-completionwell-stimulation/ Halliburton. 2010. Haynesville Shale. Halliburton, 2010 Halliburton. Available at: http://www.halliburton.com/public/solutions/co ntents/Shale/Brochures/10_B144_011_Haynes ville shale bro web.pdf Lohoefer, 2006 Lohoefer, D. S., Seale, R. A., & Athans, J. 2006. New Barnett Shale Horizontal Completion Lowers Cost and Improves Efficiency. http://dx.doi.org/10.2118/103046- MS R. Borstmayer, N. Stegent, A. Wagner, J. Borstmayer, 2011 Mullen. 2011. Approach Optimizes Completion Design. Halliburton. Available at: http://www.halliburton.com/public/pe/contents /Papers_and_Articles/web/A_through_P/Eagle %20Ford%20-%20Approach%20Optimizes%20Completion% 20Design.pdf Allen, 2013 Allen, D.T., Torres, V.M., Thomas, J., Sullivan, D.W., Harrison, M., Hendler, A., Herndon, S. C., Kolb, C.E., Fraser, M.P., Hill, A.D., Lamb, 2013. Measurements of methane emissions at natural gas production sites in the United

B.K., Miskimins, J., Sawyer, R.F., Seinfeld, J.H. States, PNAS, Available at: http://www.pnas.org/content/110/44/17768.ab stract



NETL Life Cycle Inventory Data – Process Documentation File

Section III: Document Control Information

Date Created: March 19, 2015

Point of Contact: Timothy Skone (NETL), Timothy.Skone@NETL.DOE.GOV

Revision History:

Original/no revisions

How to Cite This Document: This document should be cited as:

NETL (2015). NETL Life Cycle Inventory Data – Unit Process: Well hydraulic fracture completion – Version 01. U.S. Department of Energy, National Energy Technology Laboratory. Retrieved [date] from www.netl.doe.gov/LCA

Section IV: Disclaimer

Neither the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) National Energy Technology Laboratory (NETL) nor any person acting on behalf of these organizations:

- A. Makes any warranty or representation, express or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of the information contained in this document, or that the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this document may not infringe on privately owned rights; or
- B. Assumes any liability with this report as to its use, or damages resulting from the use of any information, apparatus, method, or process disclosed in this document.

Reference herein to any specific commercial product, process, or service by trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by NETL. The views and opinions of the authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or reflect those of NETL.